

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR       | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO |
|---|-------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| 09/813,714  | 03/21/2001  | Solomon Davidovich Labinov | 6321-194                | 3357            |
| 7590 05/24/2006   |             |                            | EXAMINER                |                 |
| Gregory A. Nelson   |             |                            | DUONG, THANH P          |                 |
| AKERMAN, SENTERFITT & EIDSON, P.A. 222 Lakeview Avenue, Suite 400 |             |                            | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER    |
| P.O. Box 3188 West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188                      |             |                            | 1764                    |                 |
|   |             |                            | DATE MAILED: 05/24/2006 |                 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s)   |  |  |
|-----------------|----------------|--|--|
| 09/813,714      | LABINOV ET AL. |  |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit       |  |  |
| Tom P. Duong    | 1764           |  |  |

|   | Tom P. Duong  | 1764  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appear   | ars on the cover sheet with the   | correspondence address  |  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 21 April 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>a)</li></ul>   | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth<br>tter than SIX MONTHS from the mailin<br>b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH | ng date of the final rejection.   |  |  |  |  |
| TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).  AMENDMENTS  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or   | nsideration and/or search (see NC<br>w);  | DTE below);   |  |  |  |  |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  | •   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  |   | ompliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ul>  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: as stated in Final Office Action.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   | ☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wided below or appended.   | ill be entered and an explanation of  |  |  |  |  |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but<br>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and<br>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  | before or on the date of filing a N<br>I sufficient reasons why the affida  | lotice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered<br>vit or other evidence is necessary and |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a<br/>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o<br/>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>  | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe  | eal and/or appellant fails to provide a   |  |  |  |  |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  |   | ·   |  |  |  |  |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but<br>See Continuation Sheet.  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)  13. Other:  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
|   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
|   | •   | ·   |  |  |  |  |



The proposed amendment to claim 88, lines 5-8, 10-14, and 16 raise new issues in this claim which would require further consideration and/or search.

Glenn Caidarola

Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 1700